Rockefeller No Loss to Peace Movement, P. 2

Quasi-Religious Note

On Lincoln's Birthday, President Johnson went down and had himself photographed making a speech beside the statue of the Great Emancipator at the Lincoln Memorial. A few days later at Dallas he was doing a Churchill and calling for "blood, sweat and tears." More recently he has tried to sound like Franklin D. Roosevelt about to land on Omaha Beach. We just can't wait to see who Lyndon Johnson casts himself as on Easter Sunday.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Now Published Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVI, NO. 7 APRIL 1, 1968 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

That Latest Domino To Topple Was LBJ's Pet General

Whatever its validity in Southeast Asia, the domino theory is working splendidly in the U.S.A. McCarthy's victory in New Hampshire toppled Bobby into a race he thought unforeseeable only two months earlier. The combined weight of McCarthy and Kennedy has knocked Westmoreland off his pedestal. Johnson has decided to promote him out of Vietnam. Johnson's conversion was as rapid and unexpected as Bobby's. As recently as February 16 the President told a press conference he had no plan for Westmoreland to leave. "If I had to select a man to lead me in battle in Vietnam," Johnson told the press that day, "I would want Gen. Westmoreland." Now Johnson suddenly discovers he doesn't want Westmoreland to lead him in battle at home. The pacification program is going even more badly in California than in the Mekong Delta, and Chicago may prove harder to hold than Saigon.

Just A Joke—Or A Preview?

Plainly a revision of strategy is in the works. My own little scenario for the next few months was drawn up as a joke but it no longer seems quite so funny since the Westmoreland announcement. I started my analysis from fundamentals. Which does Johnson hate more—Ho Chi Minh or Kennedy? You don't have to kidnap Lady Bird to learn the answer to that one. How best defeat the main enemy, when you can't defeat both? By making peace with the lesser foe and concentrating one's forces on the main one. What if Johnson at a decisive moment— after the California primary and before the Democratic convention—should take the wind out of the opposition's sails and make a dramatic move toward peace?

This might bring the Johnson strategists to a related question. Which does McCarthy hate more—Johnson or Bobby? That's also an easy one. McCarthy and Johnson have been careful to keep within limits in discussing each other even in private; that's hardly true of what they say of Bobby, and Bobby of them. What if the Johnson forces were to exploit this personal animosity and offer McCarthy second place on a Johnson ticket pledged to negotiate peace? McCarthy could then say that his candidacy had served its purpose of forcing a change in policy on Vietnam. Johnson could use the peace sentiment mobilized by McCarthy and Kennedy to give himself greater leverage to end the bombing and go to the negotiating table. A Johnson-Nixon campaign would then be a replay of the Johnson-Goldwater campaign. The Democratic party would be reunited. Kennedy—with the aid of a dentist to keep him from grinding his teeth down to his gums—would have to support the ticket on that platform. Most observers think any such strategy impossible, and believe Johnson too emotionally involved in his war. But what a temptation such a course must present to Johnson! What a way to bump off Bobby! *

Johnson's ferocious rhetoric at Minneapolis about those who dare oppose his *Kampf* in Southeast Asia recalled another war leader's raucous insistence on *Ein Reich, Ein Volk, Ein Fuehrer;* as seen on TV, only the little mustache seemed missing. Some conclude from this and similar performances that Johnson is irretrievably hooked on the war. I am still inclined to give him the benefit of his credibility gap. He was really a hawk when he sounded like a dove four years ago. Could the stepup in hawkish noises now cover a growing loss of enthusiasm for the war? There is some reason to think so. His reactions to the seizure of the Pueblo and the Tet offensive have hardly been hawkish. The Administration has done its best to get the Pueblo affair off the front pages; a certain desperation

(*Continued on Page Two*)

Counsel We Expect No One To Heed

A resolution of the almost insoluble Arab-Jewish quarel is made the more difficult by the arms traffic; a major UN goal ought to be to bring it under world control. U.S. tanks and planes were used by both Israeli and Jordanians in their latest clash, as by Greeks and Turks in the Cyprus conflict. Soviet and French arms add constantly to the tinder in this, the area most likely to set off a new world war. The Israeli see their latest raid as a necessary answer to terrorist actions which culminated in the blowing up of a school bus in the Negev. The Arabs see terrorism as the only way to recover their lost land and pride. The spiral of violence is mutually disastrous. It is making a no-man's land of Jordan's East Bank, as Arab refugees flee further east for safety. The Israeli raid has made heroes of the fedayeen and recruited their ranks. It has also made political solutions like a confederation of Israel, a West Bank Arab state and Jordan seem all the more illusory, and reconciliation more distant. Yet only in this direction can Israel prevent a new holocaust. One thing which will never come from the mouth of a gun is shalom.

*** And at no greater cost to the White House than a nervous breakdown for Walt Rostow!**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from Page One)

about Johnson's apparent indifference to the fate of the crew seems to have crept into Pyongyang's broadcasts; if the affair drags on much longer the North Koreans are liable to make the apologies just to get the crew off their hands. A President anxious for wider war would have used either the Pueblo affair or the Tet offensive as an excuse at least for partial mobilization. Two months have passed since Tet, and the President still can't make up his mind about the troop reinforcements Westmoreland asked for. Instead he is recalling Westmoreland.

Not For One Second?

That is the fact. The rest is smokescreen. On February 16 Johnson angrily denounced press reports that he might appoint Westmoreland to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. "I have never," he said indignantly, "discussed that with General Westmoreland for one second." But on March 10 the *New York Times* disclosed that Westmoreland wanted 206,000 more men. This is now blamed for the sharp and apparently last-minute rise in the McCarthy vote in the New Hampshire primary two days later; it ran 15 to 20 points higher than the polls earlier had conceded him.

The magnitude of the Westmoreland request also played its part in the run on the dollar. The day after the leak to the *New York Times,* Secretary of the Treasury Fowler admitted under questioning by Hartke in the Senate Finance Committee that so large an increase in the number of troops might add $4 billion to the budget deficit. The *Wall St. Journal* (March 14) said the escalation might lead to a sharp speculative loss in gold "even before the extra troops themselves added to the dollar outflow." Orr Kelly reported from the Pentagon in the *Washington Star* (March 12) that "the scope" of Defense Secretary Clifford's high-level committee reappraising Vietnam policy had "broadened dramatically in the last few days." "If you had asked me a week ago," one Pentagon officers told Kelly, "I'd have guessed the President would be on television within hours, announcing we were sending more men to Vietnam. Now I'm not so sure."

The problems were indicated when the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress issued a report March 18 calling the President's balance of payments program "inadequate" because "it does little about reducing our military expenditures abroad"; it estimated the foreign exchange costs, including Vietnam, at $4.3 billion. It warned against trying to meet these costs "by deflating the economy into a depression." In supplementary views, one member of the committee, Moorhead (*D.-Pa.*) said that if the President sends 200,000 more troops to Vietnam "he risks a possible collapse of the international monetary system which for two decades has lubricated the most spectacular prosperity the industrial world has ever known."

Another but little noticed factor in the President's decision four days later to promote Westmoreland out of Vietnam was an interview in which Senator Russell of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, had criticized Westmoreland for sticking to what Russell called "outmoded World War II tactics." (*Washington Star,* February 29.) In criticizing Westmoreland's adherence to large battalion-sized units Russell said scathingly that "we have very nearly followed the strategy of the French." Indeed Westmoreland's silly optimism recalls Navarre's before Dienbienphu. The *coup de grace* was Neil Sheehan's disclosure in the *New York Times* March 21 that on the very eve of the Tet offensive

A Spokesman for "Free Asia" Offers A New Definition of False Liberalism

Bangkok, March 11—Thailand's Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman said today he hoped nuclear weapons would not have to be used in Vietnam but the U.S. would be justified in using them if the alternative were "defeat and annihilation of our forces" at places like Khe Sanh. . . . Mr. Thanat said it would be "false liberalism" to oppose the use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam as a last resort. . . Mr. Thanat, recently back from the U.S. where he received medical treatment is especially incensed by American and other critics of President Johnson's Vietnam policy. . . .

—R. H. Shackford in Scripps-Howard papers, Mar. 11

Did his medical treatment perchance include a brain-washing?

Rockefeller No Loss to Peace Movement—His Record on Foreign Policy Hawkish

Behind Rockefeller's ignominious silence on Vietnam (see adjoining box) is a more consistently hawkish record than that of any other candidate, except perhaps Nixon. The Rockefeller Brothers report of 1958, in which Nelson played a major role, was an effort to pressure the Eisenhower Administration into larger arms expenditures for Pax Americana policies. The Kennedy Administration's boost in arms expenditures, development of "flexible response" for limited wars, and its more belligerent foreign policies all met with Rockefeller's approval, though he did not think Kennedy went far enough. Rockefeller was for a second try at Castro after the Bay of Pigs and he supported the nuclear test agreement reluctantly. He was the country's leading enthusiast for the delusion that there could be civil defense against nuclear war. He was for U.S. intervention in the Congo, where the Rockefellers have extensive interests and as late as March 19, 1967, he was fervent in his support of Johnson in Vietnam. GOP doves like Gen. Gavin and Sen. Morton have deluded themselves.

Big Bold Leadership Dept.

Q. Governor, could you please outline for us your views on Vietnam?

A. Sure. My position on Vietnam is very simple. . . I think that our concept as a nation, and that our actions, have not kept pace with the changing conditions. And therefore our actions are not completely relevant today to the realities of the magnitude and the complexity of the problems that we face in this conflict.

Q. Governor, what does that mean?

A. Just what I said.

Q. Governor, you said that your Vietnam policy will offer constructive alternatives to President Johnson . . . [and] to Mr. Nixon's Vietnam policy . . .

A. Well, I'm not in a position to discuss anybody's policies, frankly. . . .

Q. Governor Rockefeller, should we now cease the bombing of North Vietnam?

A. I am not prepared to make any tactical suggestion.

—At the Rockefeller press conference, March 21.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Westmoreland had sent Washington a confidential report predicting that 1968 would be a year of great victories in 1969 against an enemy "increasingly confined to staging 'frontier battles.'" These giddy forecasts were made while the enemy, *from bases inside South Vietnam* (as U.S. intelligence now admits), was massing 60,000 troops and huge stocks of ammunition for his massive simultaneous attacks on the country's cities and U.S. military bases.

It is surprising that Johnson should have called a press conference the very next day to announce Westmoreland's promotion. Usually press leaks of this kind only stiffen Johnson's resistance. One wonders whether this leak did not come from within the Administration and with its approval. It is striking that when the President was asked whether the Westmoreland promotion indicated any change in the strategy associated with his name, Johnson replied that this would be up to Westmoreland's successor. He could have said that Westmoreland as Army Chief of Staff would continue to determine strategy but he didn't.

Not the Magnanimous Type

Thus many different forces are converging toward a change. How far it will go, what form it will take, remains to be seen. Within little more than two months, the whole situation—military in Vietnam, political in the United States—has been drastically transformed. With it, the chances of peace have risen. I myself believe, though I have no evidence other than certain atmospheric subtleties in Pentagon conversations, that the new Secretary of Defense, Clark Clifford, is pressing for a fresh and astringent look at the whole Vietnamese war. To this change Senator McCarthy's brave and lonely foray into the primaries has made a major contribution. He stuck his neck out when prospects looked very poor indeed and New Hampshire was his reward. I share the bitterness of many young people toward Bobby Kennedy for hastily plunging in to steal the limelight and the prize from McCarthy as soon as it looked promising. It would have been magnanimous of Kennedy to come out in support of McCarthy in the primaries and then let the convention choose between them but Kennedy is not the magnanimous type. The race between them is becoming a race between college idealists and the Kennedy credit cards.*

But this bitterness should not lead one to lose sight of the political realities. Bobby may be arrogant and power-hungry; he may be surrounded by the same group of opportunist-intellectuals who surrounded his brother when he got us into the Vietnamese mess; but he alone has the money, the fame, the organization, and the drive for the formidable task of taking the nomination away from Johnson, and giving us some hope of negotiating peace. The latest Gallup poll shows him outrunning Johnson among Democrats 44 to 41 percent while Johnson, though slipping, still outruns McCarthy 59 to 29 percent. McCarthy deserves full support in the primaries but at some point he and Kennedy will have to join forces unless, as I indicated in my little joke at the beginning, Johnson should pull a fast one. McCarthy's last minute refusal to have a joint slate with Kennedy in the District of Columbia indicates that the split between the two men is widening. This may give Johnson unexpected options at the convention, and make Kennedy sorry he was not a little less crude in dealing with McCarthy. The surprises in this surprising campaign have only just begun.

Where The "Strategy of Attrition" (i.e. Butchery) May Lead

Whether General Westmoreland has asked for a further 206,000 troops, or whether something less than 40% reinforcement would satisfy him, he has made it clear he sees his military problem in little less crude terms than a slugging match. . . . Does the Pentagon's present plan for winning the war not boil down to exchanging the lives of American youth for those of Vietnamese youth in the hope the time will come when no young Vietnamese are left. . . . ? Such questions reflect the fear that the Pentagon has no better answer in North Vietnam than the Generals of the first World War had in France. . . . It is possible the Pentagon calculates that, when the American public realizes that bombing and firepower cannot stop the flood of men and material flowing North to South, in broad streams where once it flowed in rivulets, a climate of exasperation will develop in which it would be possible to ask for a reversal of President Johnson's ban on the use of nuclear weapons.

—Editorial in The Times *(London) March 4*

*** "Staff members," said a Washington Post story March 25 about the Kennedy campaign, "are racing around the country on the credit cards of Joseph P. Kennedy and various family enterprises." The rich can campaign on credit.**

Maybe Somebody Ought to Call the Senator "Boy" and See What Happens

Gov. Romney: The [Detroit] rioters were more concerned about indignities . . . at the hands of white policemen and others than they were about issues such as housing, jobs and education . . . in 80 per cent of the cases the complainants are not talking about physical brutality of any type; they are talking about the treatment they received, about policemen calling Negro adults 'boys". . . .

Sen. McClellan (D. Ark.): Is there any report on the Negroes calling a white man "whitey" and "honky"?

Gov. Romney: It would be an interesting report.

Sen. McClellan: If you call a Negro a boy, if he is working, in my section of the country nobody ever thought of it as an offense. You thought of it as a friendly thing. You say the same thing to a white boy, a white man. It is a common term. You say, 'Boy, do this" or "Boy, do that." It is no disrespect. . . .

Gov. Romney: When we travel in foreign countries we do things frequently which are to us quite normal, but which are offensive to others.

Sen. McClellan: . . . If they are going to be so sensitive about being called a boy, I guess a whitey might be sensitive about being called a whitey. . . . People will have to rise above these little things.

Gov. Romney: I agree that is a desirable thing, but on the other hand, you have to deal with the hard realities.

Sen. McClellan: We can deal with the hard realities and deal with them in a hard way, sometimes, instead of coddling. If we're going to try to patronize or accommodate all of these little whims. . . .

—Before the McClellan Committee, March 19. Another tidbit of Romney's testimony was his observation that during the Detroit riot it was lucky that the East Side "cooled off" when the federal troops arrived, because "at that time" the paratroopers "were not trained in riot control, to my knowledge, beyond that of just going in and demolishing an area."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Excerpts from Anti-War Speeches by Congressmen from Both Parties on March 18

Revolt Against Johnson's Vietnam Policies and Escalation Spreads to the House

REP. HORTON (*R.-N.Y.*): There is increasing evidence that the war in Vietnam is in the gravest danger of escalating into something much beyond the category of "limited war". It cannot be stressed too strongly that Congress did not intend in 1964, and does not intend in 1968 that the President be permitted to send additional thousands of Americans to fight, and perhaps to die, in a conflict no longer influenced by the House and Senate.

REP. WOLFF (*D.-N.Y.*): I believe the time has long since passed for the House of Representatives to have an oversight committee, a joint committee of both Houses formed. We have had such a committee in other wars. The Truman committee was an example of this. I believe we should investigate all of the various activities that have gone on during the war and preliminary to it.

REP. SCHWENGEL (*R.-Iowa*): What concerns me at the present time is the current unwillingness on the part of the administration to consider alternatives to its present course of action. In fact, its present policy is framed to preclude this type consideration.

REP. SNYDER (*R.-Ky.*): Your attention is called to the last paragraph of the [Gulf of Tonkin] message that the President had sent down [in 1964] in which he said in essence, "Look, it is August now. The Congress is going to be going into the 50 States campaigning in this election year. Modern warfare being what it is"—and we all remember the circumstances which brought about the Second World War and Pearl Harbor—"the Executive needs the authority to act in the event of any eventuality. For the next few months, from August until Congress reconvenes in January the Executive needs the authority to act in the event of some circumstances or emergency of this nature occurring." That was the essence of part of the President's message. I do not have the exact wording here. That 3-month period has now stretched into 3½ years.

REP. BURTON (*D.-Cal.*): Mr. Speaker, some of the Members of the House were not here during the course of that debate. If my memory serves me correctly . . . we spent a total of about 60 minutes, some 57 or 58 of those 60 minutes being utilized by proponents of the resolution, with little or no opportunity even on this side of the aisle to question those managing the bill. Also, if my memory serves me correctly, we were given virtually no notice.

REP. HUNGATE (*D.-Mo.*): I have been here about 3½ years now and we have spent more time in discussing cherry marketing than we have on this vital question of Vietnam. . .

REP. MORSE (*R.-Mass.*): The issue is the clarity of our policies in Southeast Asia—our goals and objectives and the means used to achieve them.

REP. KEITH (*R.-Mass.*): Mr. Speaker, I was one of the original sponsors of this resolution last year, and I support it with even greater urgency today. The direction of our efforts in Vietnam seems even less clear today than at the time of the original resolution, and a constructive reassessment and debate by the Congress is now needed. . . .

REP. WOLFF (*D.-N.Y.*): I propose before the week is out to offer a resolution to repeal the Tonkin Gulf resolution and ask all Members who are interested in once again reasserting the authority of the Congress to join me.

REP. RUPPE (*R.-Mich.*): The hard fact is that Southeast Asia has a long history of Caucasian colonial intervention. No matter how well intended our presence, nor how great our sacrifices, in the eyes of many Asians we are shackled with the colonial past.

REP. GUDE (*R.-Md.*): The United States has obligated more than $21 million in land reform assistance since 1954 in South Vietnam. What has been the result of that expense? Out of 2.47 million acres of land available, only about 667,000 have been distributed to the peasants.

REP. FINDLEY (*R.-Ill.*): Secretary of State Rusk in his testimony to the Senate committee the other day placed so much emphasis on this idea that the United States must make its word good. If making our word good necessarily requires, let us say, the loss of 20,000 lives in South Vietnam, and the use of over a half million people, and over 100,000 casualties, then, if we have a similar commitment to Thailand, does it necessarily follow that without any further reference to the Congress the President is duty bound to pour an equal amount of resources into that other country?

REP. LEGGETT (*D.-Cal.*): When the President callously pronounced yesterday that in spite of the resentment building in the country he was sending another 35,000 young boys into war, I now say we are heading toward disaster. I am incensed that the President's hypnotic trance over Vietnam is catatonic and immutable and I must forthwith withdraw my entire support from this foreign policy. I find that the same forces in the country who are blind to or by early inbred training refuse to consider the root causes of Negro despondency and seek to resolve the problem by arms, are the same ones who are urging the United States to escalate in Vietnam, to drop atomic bombs, buy mercenaries, and wage all-out war against Red China.

REP. MCCLOSKEY (*R.-Cal.*): We believed that we could succeed where the French had failed, believing that somehow our good motive would be accepted although the colonial motives of the French had been understandably repugnant to patriotic Vietnamese. These beliefs have not been borne out by the facts. The Vietcong are nationalists as well as Communists. "Vietnam for the Vietnamese" may be as inspirational an ideal as our own Monroe Doctrine.

Three "Put The Brakes On" Resolutions

The excerpts on this page are from speeches made in the House March 18 in support of three resolutions which would put the brakes on the Vietnamese war. The one with the widest support, by Findley (R. Ill.) calls for an investigation by "appropriate committees" of both Houses to determine "whether further Congressional action is desirable in respect to U.S. policies in Southeast Asia." It has 142 co-sponsors, including 102 Republicans. The second by Moorhead (D. Pa.) would put the Congress on record against any increased military involvement in Vietnam. It has 26 co-sposors. The third, by Boland (D. Mass.) opposes any increase in U.S. forces in Vietnam "without the explicit consent of Congress." It has 17 co-sponsors. Roughly a third of the House is for one or another of these resolutions.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Int'l Commission of Jurists Protests Use of Napalm and Aerial Bombardment

Hague Convention for Protection of Civilians Violated by U.S. In Vietnam

The International Commission of Jurists in Geneva has been treated by the U.S. as a cold war instrument and was once alleged to have CIA financing. When on March 7 it issued a moving report which criticized U.S. military tactics in Vietnam as violations of international law, it was big news in the European press but brushed under the rug in the U.S. We obtained a copy and print an abridged version here, including its comments on the massacres and civil wars in Indonesia and Nigeria:

The spread of brutality throughout the world and its contagious effect on humanity was the subject-matter of a statement made by the International Commission of Jurists in September 1966. This statement is unfortunately no less relevant today. The wave of brutality that was condemned then has gathered momentum and threatens to submerge the world in a cataclysm of horror. The unprecedented scale of the massacres in Indonesia, for example, and the widespread slaughter that is accompanying the civil war in Nigeria have aroused a profound sense of shame and indignation throughout the world. However, the present situation in Vietnam, where a steady escalation in brutality is taking place, is undoubtedly the most striking and most distressing example.

Shooting Prisoners of War

The right of the parties to a conflict to adopt means of injuring the enemy is not unlimited. Thus, the deliberate killing of a prisoner of war, which was instanced by recent widely-published press photographs has become notorious. Such an act is even more inexcusable when it is committed by a person of high rank, for it is then bound to be regarded as an example to be followed. Under any view it must be considered a crime which calls for sanction.

Attention should also be drawn to the fact that on the 19th May 1967, the International Committee of the Red Cross in a communication to all governments drew attention to the need to provide more up to date and comprehensive international safeguards for civilian populations and other victims of armed conflicts. The "laws of war" date from the Hague Conventions of 1907, before the invention of the means of mass destruction used in modern warfare such as napalm, aerial bombardments, chemical warfare and nuclear weapons. Its provisions nonetheless remain relevant today and do provide a guide. The principle set out in the Preamble to the Convention, which requires that both in the use of weapons and in the conduct of operations the civilian population and the combatants should be protected, remains fully in force.

Imagine What It Can Do To People

Washington, March 18 (AP)—Napalm is being burned in South Vietnam in a steadily increasing volume. Figures compiled by the Defense Department show the Air Force alone has dumped more than 100,000 tons of napalm on Vietnam since 1963. The Navy also drops napalm bombs, and the Army uses large quantities in flame-throwers but they have not compiled tonnage figures. The Air Force used nearly 55,000 tons of napalm in 1966 alone, far outpacing the 32,215 tons dropped in the 3-year Korean war. . . . The big 1966 jump in napalm in Vietnam paralleled development of a hotter compound called napalm B, capable of turning truck engines into liquid steel. . . .

—Associated Press ticker, March 18. This story was due to the initiative of Robert Horton, the AP's man at the Pentagon. The figures cited cover 1966. We asked the press office whether later figures were classified, but could get no answer.

It is also highly desirable that strict adherence be given to the provisions of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 which "prohibits the use of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases and of all analogous liquids, material or devices."

The parties to the Geneva Conventions are bound by Article 1 not only themselves to respect the humanitarian rules contained in these Conventions but also to *ensure their respect in all circumstances.* Therefore each of the 117 States which is a party to the Geneva Conventions has a direct duty to use its best endeavours to secure the observance of the Geneva Conventions. It is regrettable that this collective responsibility arising out of the Geneva Conventions has never been acted upon in the Vietnam conflict.

In present circumstances there is little hope that the voice of reason will persuade the belligerents to open negotiations for a cease-fire and a peaceful solution of the Vietnam conflict. In the meantime, however, it is becoming daily more important that the United Nations and the Red Cross should join forces in an effort to ensure that the Hague Convention and the Geneva Conventions are more fully respected.

Consultations of this nature could equally well take place in other cases, such as that of Nigeria where there is open warfare, or the Sudan where a secret war is being carried on. It is imperative to the stability of our present civilization that the growing brutality and the massacres of innocent victims in Vietnam and in other strife-torn areas be brought to an end.

100 Israeli Intellectuals Protest Violations of the Rights of Man

"Israeli citizens, Jews and Arabs, are subject to house arrest or held without trial. Collective punishments, notably the dynamiting of houses and the imposition of curfews, continue to be inflicted on the inhabitants of the occupied territories to an alarming extent. Families of workers and peasants, children, women and elderly folk, are deprived of shelter and means of existence. The flood of refugees fleeing Gaza and the West Bank continues. An increasing number of Arabs are driven from the West Bank by order of the Israeli military governor. . . .

"Where can these methods lead us except to an abyss of hate? Such acts can only stiffen the clandestine resistance, make new victims on both sides and breed a new war with unforeseeable consequences. A people which dominates another exposes itself to moral degeneration and undermines its own democratic regime. A people which oppresses another ends by losing its own liberty.

"Jewish citizens! Remember how non-Jews came to our help in our moments of distress. Misfortune now strikes at our brother Arab people. Do you think it just to wash your hands of this, that you keep silent?"

—Appeal by 100 Israeli intellectuals—novelists, composers, journalists, clergymen, professors, doctors, lawyers and film-makers—protesting "violation of the rights of man in Israel and its occupied territories", translated from Le Monde, *March 12.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Peace Petitioners Within The Government Threatened With Suspension and HUAC

The White House Applies A Double Standard to Employe Political Activity

The White House has a revolt on its doorstep in the anti-war petition more than 1500 Federal employes have signed. Among them are employes of the Executive Offices, the State Department and the Pentagon. While the White House has been pressuring the Civil Service Commission to "do something" about these dissidents, the Administration through House Majority Leader Albert has been trying to get a law exempting D.C.'s "Mayor" Walter Washington from the Hatch Act so he could campaign for Johnson. Negro radio stations in Washington are already running local Democratic Committee spots urging votes for Johnson in the primary because "he gave us Mayor Washington" [a Negro]. Never did the title carry less real power.

The Harshest Dissenter of Them All

If Federal employes are to be punished for expressing dim views of the war, the most eminent candidate for punitive action should be Wm. McChesney Martin, Jr., chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, who told the Detroit Economics Club March 18 the new two-price system for gold was only "gimmickry" and would not solve the crisis. He warned that the U.S. was militarily overcommitted around the world and said, "At some point, we've got to get leadership."

"That's much harsher than the petition, which merely asks the President to end his "reliance on military force and to seek instead a genuine political settlement in Southeast Asia." The employes have found defenders in nine House liberal Democrats* and in Ervin (*D.-N.C.*) chairman of the Senate's Constitutional Rights subcommittee. Ervin told the *Washington Daily News* March 20 that they had the same rights as other citizens to petition the government.

The absence of any real authority to prevent U.S. employes from speaking out on foreign policy is indicated by the introduction of a bill to allow the President to suspend with or without pay any employe who, in a time of armed conflict abroad, in any way opposes the war. The sponsor of the bill is Chairman Willis of House Un-American Activities Committee which is making the anti-war movement its new target. Within 48 hours Willis issued statements attacking (1) the Federal petition and (2) the movement for an international student strike April 26.

The Committee has been trying since the late 30s—as it were—to repeal the First Amendment as un-American; it's lucky Jefferson is dead or they'd serve a subpoena on him. Yet this oldest, most un-American activity of Congress was given $375,000 by the House March 13; only 78 nays could be marshalled for the Edwards motion to recommit the appropriation bill for hearings. Its counterpart in the art of witch-hunting, the Senate Internal Security subcommittee, was voted $400,000 by the Senate two days later. By comparison, only $75,000 was voted for an inquiry into the plight of migratory workers. Between Johnson's recent speeches implying that opposition to the war is disloyal and the conditioned reflexes of these two committees, it may soon be open season on peaceniks. But we believe that as in New Hampshire any such effort will backfire.

Triumph Of Jefferson Over Lenin

Several fundamental observations on convulsions in the Soviet bloc: The first is that the best youth will struggle for freedom of expression even if brought up in closed societies; to speak freely is as natural as to breathe. The second is that any bureaucracy, however idealistic its origins, will degenerate in the absence of criticism; so we see the Polish Communists, despite a belated feeble effort to the contrary by Gomulka, dabbling in anti-Semitism—just like Stalin and Czarist Russia before them. The third observation is that "de-Stalinization" will never be firm until Lenin's authoritarianism is boldly analyzed and abandoned. The fourth is that peaceful social change may also be possible under Communist rule; for the first time public opinion in a Communist State has been strong enough to oust the leadership; Novotny's fall in Czechoslovakia must set off seismic tremors in every other Communist capital. This is not a revolt against material circumstance; it is not a revolt against socialism—no demand is heard to restore capitalism; it is a revolt for that right to speak which is the first essential of any good society. It is the triumph of Jefferson over Lenin.

* **Burton, Brown and Edwards (Cal.), Dow, Rosenthal and Ryan (N.Y.), Conyers (Mich.), Fraser (Minn.) and Kastenmeier (Wis.).**

If You Enjoyed Stone's New Book, You Might Like A Copy of His Earlier Collection, "The Haunted Fifties" Out of Print in This Country—A Few Copies of The English Edition Are Now Available at The Original Cut Price of $4.95

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed $6.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, In A Time of Torment (Random House) regular price $7.95

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Weekly 4/1/68

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20015

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every other Monday at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED